REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.   Claims 1-4 and 8-9 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 8-9 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) by Moehrle (U.S. Patent No. 7,216,301) and . Applicants traverse.

Claim 1 recites a method, comprising: rendering a display of names of a first and second data sets in a search panel, wherein each data set is associated with one or more file components; receiving selection of the displayed first data set name in the search panel; displaying names of the file components associated with the selected first data set in the search panel; receiving selection of at least one of the displayed file component names associated with the selected first data set; rendering the selected data set name and the selected at least one selected file component name in a history panel, wherein the selected first data set name and selected at least one file component are displayed in a hierarchical tree arrangement; receiving selection of the displayed second data set name in the search panel; displaying names of the file components associated with the selected second data set in the search panel; receiving selection of at least one of the displayed file component names associated with the selected second data set; and rendering the selected second data set name and the selected at least one selected file component name associated with the selected second data set in the history panel, wherein the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the first and second data sets are displayed together in the hierarchical tree arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets.

The Examiner cited FIG. 4A, element 102, FIG. 4B, elements 10b-10d, FIG. 4C, and col. 5, lines 6-9 of Moehrle as disclosing the claim requirement of rendering a display of at least one data set name, wherein each data set is associated with one or more file components. (OA3, pgs. 2-3) Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

The cited FIG. 4A, element 102 provides an initial view of an active path having a single active link. Moehrle defines an active path as a sequence of active links as items, where an active link provides direct access to a function corresponding level or menu item without the need to navigate using a GUI. (Moehrle, col. 2, lines 45-51). FIGs. 4B shows a user browsing the active path 100 of FIG. 4A, rolling over active link 1.2.3 causes the display of all siblings of

the rolled over active link, 1.2.3.1, 1.2.3.2, 1.2.3.3.... Rolling over an active link displays the siblings and children of the active link. (Moehrle, col. 5, lines 27-32)

The cited Moehrle discusses displaying hierarchical active links or menu items that are used to execute functions. (Moehrle, col. 5, lines 4-20). This does not teach or suggest rendering the selected data set name and a selected file component name in a search panel and history panel in a hierarchical tree arrangement. Instead, the cited active links arranged in a hierarchical fashion comprise functions the user may select. The cited links do not comprise a data set name and selected file component name of the selected data set name.

The Examiner further found that

It can be seen from the teachings of Moehrle that during the normal course of operation the user may initiate another search by returning to a previous level and repeating the steps of opening a second data set and selecting a second file component from the second data set and display a hierarchical history of browsing in the panel (ie. Top line)

(OA3, pg. 3)

Applicants traverse this finding because Moehrle concerns displaying active links. If an active link selected is not an end link, then subordinate levels are displayed, if an end link is selected, the associated function is re-executed. (Moehrle, col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 21) The claims require selection and display of data set names and component files of the data set names. The cited Moehrle concerns the display of active links to provide selection of functions associated with active links, not selection of data set names and their component files as claimed.

The Examiner cited FIG. 8 and accompanying text of Rochford as teaching the claim requirements upon selecting a first and second data set names in a search view and selecting file components of the first and second data set names in the search panel, the selected first and second data set names and selected file components are displayed in a separate history panel that displays to together selected first and second data set names and the selected file components of the selected first and second data set names separately from the search panel in which the data set and file component names were selected. (OA3, pg. 3) Applicants traverse.

Rochford discusses a layer cake selection window in which the user may select regions and attributes to display network components for the selected region and attributes. FIGs. 2A-3B of Rochford show how a user may select a region as a base view and then select an attribute to further narrow the display to network features in the base view region. (Rochford, cols. 7-8

and 11-13) The cited FIG. 8 is a history window in which selected features are displayed, where if a selected attribute is dependent on the base view, such as a selected region, then the base view on which the selected feature depends is also displayed. (Rochford, col. 17, lines 3-19)

The cited FIG. 8 of Rochford does not teach or suggest rendering the selected first and second data set names and the selected at least one selected file component name associated with the selected first and second data sets in a history panel, wherein the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the first and second data sets are displayed together in the hierarchical tree arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets. Instead, the cited FIG. 8 discusses displaying in a history panel attributes of network features and the geographical region for which the attribute was selected.   The cited history panel of FIG. 8 discusses displaying the region and network attributes used to filter a search. This does not teach displaying a selected data set name and a file component name as claimed in a hierarchical tree. Applicants submit that the cited network features for a region base view do not comprise a file component of a data set as claimed. Thus, the history panel of Rochford cannot display selected data set names and selected file component names of the selected data set names because Rochford does not display components of a data set name, but instead displays regions and network attributes used to filter a search.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claim 1 is patentable over the cited art because the cited Moehrle and Rochford do not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-4 and 8-9 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claim 1, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and further requires that the first and second data set names are displayed as a parent at a higher hierarchical level to the file components associated with the displayed first and second data set names, wherein the file components are rendered as children in the history panel of the first or second data set with which they are associated.

Claim 2 is amended to clarify that the displaying is with respect to first and second data set names, as cited in base claim 1.

The Examiner cited FIG. 4B, 10a-102, 101 and col. 3, lines 22-23 of Moehrle with respect to these claims.   (OA3, pgs. 4-5)

The cited FIG. 4B of Moehrle shows menu items that are siblings, where the menu items are active links. Rolling over an active link with a pointer results in the display of siblings and children of the active link. (col. 5, lines 27-31) The active links are functions that may be executed. Nowhere does the cited FIG. 4B teach a history panel that displays a selected first and second data set names as a parent to their associated file components, which is different from the search panel displaying data set names and file component names which the user may select. Instead, the cited FIG. 4B displays a hierarchical arrangement of active links that may be selected to execute a function, not those selected data set file component names as claimed. The cited col. 3 references the detailed description.

The cite FIG. 8 of Rochford discusses a history panel showing searched regions and network attributes used to filter a region search in a history panel. This does not teach displaying data set names as a parent at a higher hierarchical level to file components. The Examiner has not cited where Rochford teaches that the cited regions are at a parent hierarchical level to the network features also used to filter the search. Instead, the cited Rochford discusses how the network features searched on are dependent on the previous base view or region filtering. However, there is no teaching that the region comprises a parent at a higher hierarchical level to the network feature searched upon in FIGs. 3A and 3B.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that dependent claim 2 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of claim 2 are not taught or suggested in the cited Moehrle and Rochford.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and further requires transmitting a request for file component names of the selected data set name, wherein the displayed file component names comprise file component names returned in response to the transmitted request for file component names.

The Examiner cited col. 9, lines 16-20 as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (OA3, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 9 mentions a data file representing the hierarchical structure of a multi-level hierarchical website is either constructed or retrieved from the server. The data file representing the information hierarchy of the location may be dynamically created from the directory structure and the hypertext markup language (HTML) available on the server and client files.

Although the cited col. 9 mentions retrieving a data file representing a hierarchical structure of a web site, this does not teach transmitting a request for file components of a selected data set name, where the displayed file component names for the selected data set name are the file component names returned in response to the transmitted request for the file component names. Instead, the cited col. 9 discusses retrieving a data file representing a hierarchical structure of a web site, not file component names associated with a selected data set name.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that dependent claim 4 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of claim 4 are not taught or suggested in the cited Moehrle and Rochford.

2.   Claims 6, 7, and 10 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 7, and 10 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Moehrle in view of Rochford and Arkhipov (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2005/0114769) Applicants traverse.

These claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claim 1, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, these claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art for the following reasons.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and further requires that the file components include source code files being accessed by a developer.

The Examiner cited Arkhipov as teaching editing source coded files. Although the editing of source code files is known in the art, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not cited any reference that teaches providing a search panel and history panel for displaying and selecting data set names and file components of the data sets as claimed, where the file components comprise source code files being accessed by a developer. The cited Moehrle provides a user interface for selecting active links or functions and the cited Rochford discusses a user interface for selecting network features and filtering on regions and network attributes. There is no teaching in any of the references that the user interfaces of Moehrle and Rochford may be modified to display file components comprising source code files of data sets. Further, the Examiner has not provided any motivation for using the user interfaces of Moehrle and Rochford, which are used to selective functions and network features, to select source code files of data sets.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that dependent claim 6 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of claim 4 are not taught or suggested in the cited Moehrle, Rochford, and Arkhipov.

Similarly, with respect to claim 7, the Examiner has not cited any art suggesting or teaching using the user interfaces of Moehrle and Rochford to allow selection of source code files in data sets that are in different programming languages. Accordingly, claim 7 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

3.   Added Claims 31-48

Added claims 31-39 include the requirements of claim 1-4 and 6-10 in system form. The preamble and first two limitations of claim 31 are disclosed in claim 11 as presented in the Amendment dated January 4, 2008 ("First Amendment") and in FIG. 11 and paras. 23 and 29 of the Specification.

Added claims 40-48 include the requirements of claim 1-4 and 6-10 in article of manufacture form. The preamble is disclosed in original claim 21 and FIG. 11 and paras. 23 and 29 of the Specification.

Claims 31-48 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1-4 and 6-10.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-4, 6-10, and 31-48 are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: March 30, 2009

By:____/David Victor/_____

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867